

Professional Organizations and Process to Assess Equivalence 2007-08

Professional Services Division

May 1, 2008

Overview of this Report

At the October 2007 and January 2008 Committee meeting, the Committee discussed ways to better coordinate accreditation activities for programs seeking both state and professional or national accreditation. Section 7 of the adopted Accreditation Framework addresses this topic from the policy standpoint, but the procedural issues still remain to be addressed by the COA. The Committee directed staff to begin to collect information from the various national professional accrediting bodies to determine if and where commonalities might exist in their standards and accrediting processes with that of the Commission's and Committee on Accreditation. Because this topic includes not only a consideration of the alignment of each of the professional organization standards with state standards; but also an analysis of the coherence, frequency, and common purpose of state and professional organization's accreditation activities, this agenda item outlines a plan for addressing this topic.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends adoption of the proposed plan to address the topic of professional organizations and the process to assess equivalence of standards.

Background

Education Code 44374 (f) provides for the option of a program or institution to substitute national or professional accreditation for the Commission's accreditation activities. But this ability to "substitute" is restricted by the conditions delineated in the *Accreditation Framework*.

Section 7B of the *Accreditation Framework* provides the following language related to national accreditation of a credential program.

B. National Accreditation of a Credential Program

1. The accrediting entity agrees to use the adopted California Program Standards for the specific credential under Option 1, or the standards used by the national entity are determined by the Committee to be equivalent to those adopted by the Commission under Option 1.
2. The accreditation team represents ethnic and gender diversity.
3. The accreditation team includes both postsecondary members and elementary and secondary school practitioners; a minimum of one voting member is from California.
4. The period of accreditation is consistent with a seven-year cycle and is compatible with the accreditation activities established by the state.

5. Nationally accredited credential programs participate in the unit accreditation process. The national accreditation of the program serves in lieu of the state's Program Assessment process.

It has been the expressed desire of the COA and the Accreditation Study Work Group to continue to work identifying ways in which national professional accreditation can be better coordinated with the Commission's accreditation system. The questions posed in the COA's October 2007 and January 2008 agenda item on this topic included the following:

1. What procedures should the COA implement to allow programs the options allowed to them by the Education Code?
2. How should program standards from national professional organizations be reviewed for equivalence to California's adopted program standards?
3. Who should be responsible for initiating a review of standards for equivalence?
4. How can national professional accreditation be coordinated with i) Biennial Reports; ii) Program Assessment; and iii) Site Visits.

Proposed Plan

Staff recognizes that there are two major activities that need to be undertaken to better align national professional organizational accreditation with the Commission's system. First, there needs to be an assessment of the alignment of the standards of the professional organization with the Commission's adopted standards. Second, there needs to be an analysis of the coherence, frequency, and common purpose of state and professional or national organization's accreditation activities to determine whether any of the professional or national organization's activities can be used in lieu of the Commission's.

Alignment of Standards

Previous to the revision of the Accreditation Framework, there were instances where a professional organization's standards were deemed equivalent to California's adopted program standards. Once equivalence was granted, a program could choose to write to the professional or national standards instead of the adopted California standards. This is the same process that the COA has completed with the NCATE Unit standards. As part of the process, staff created a crosswalk that demonstrates the alignment between the Commission's Common Standards and the NCATE unit standards, identifying the specific elements of the Common Standards that a institution must address if it is writing to the NCATE Unit Standards, <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-files/CTC-NCATE-Crosswalk.doc>

In its review of this topic, the Accreditation Study Work Group and the COA confirmed this process, but made clear their concern that all California programs must satisfy all the Commission's accreditation requirements. Specifically, the recommendation from the COA reads "All California programs must participate in the California accreditation process. California supports national program accreditation when the national program review can be coordinated with the California process." It further noted that national or professional organizations may do the preliminary work of determining alignment of national or professional standards to California standards, but the COA will review all standard for comparability.

To date, whenever an institution determined that it wanted to exercise its option under the Accreditation Framework that national or professional standards be used instead of the California

standards, it was incumbent upon the institution to illustrate the alignment of the two sets of standards.

There are numerous national or professional organizations each on different standards adoption schedules. Ideally, staff would be able to convene expert panels of reviewers in each credential area to conduct an alignment study of each of the national professional organizations and to revisit this process each time there was a change in standards. At this time, this process is not financially feasible. In addition, there may be different levels of interest in the state for alignment. Some credential areas may be very interested in an alignment with national or professional organizations and others may find it inconsequential.

As such, staff proposes a similar process to that of the current process. However, staff recognizes the need to enhance the current process and to better articulate the steps within the process to determine the comparability of standards.

Staff proposes the process for alignment be conducted as follows:

- 1) The Commission must receive a request for the application for national or professional organization standards alignment. This request can be submitted by an institution in preparation for their accreditation activities or can be from a national or professional organization.
- 2) The institution, national, or professional organization submitting the request can choose to conduct the analysis of alignment and submit a preliminary alignment matrix for approval by the COA. This process is estimated to take between 3 and 6 months; or:
- 3) The institution, national, or professional organization submitting the request can request that the Commission convene a panel to develop an alignment matrix. When the request is submitted, it will be important for the request to identify upcoming accreditation activities that would utilize this alignment. This will serve to prioritize the requests for alignment to those that will actually be used for accreditation activities. This option could take up to one year to complete.
- 4) In accordance with its statutory responsibility to determine comparability of standards, COA would make a determination of comparability and, if satisfied, would approve the matrix. Or the COA may identify concepts or elements in the California standards that are missing in the national or professional standards. The COA may choose to approve an alignment matrix that identifies these additional concepts and requires institutions to address the national or professional standards AND the identified elements from the Commission's adopted standards.
- 5) Upon approval by the COA, the alignment matrix may be used by the institution to submit its response to the standards. The matrix will show where the response used for the national professional organization may be used, and where it will need to be supplemented to ensure that all aspects of the California standards are addressed.
- 6) Upon approval by the COA, the alignment matrix may be used by other institutions up for their accreditation activities, upon notification via the institutional response to the preconditions. The matrix would no longer be valid at the time that there are adopted revisions to either the state standards or the national or professional organizations.

A draft Request for Alignment form is included as Appendix A for COA consideration.

Analysis of Professional Organization's Accreditation Activities

The Commission staff began to review the various accreditation activities conducted and required by each of the identified professional accrediting bodies. The January 2008 agenda item included a review of some of these activities. The matrix of these activities is included as Appendix B.

One of most frequent questions Commission staff currently receives about the new accreditation system is whether the reporting requirements for the national professional organizations can be used or substituted for the Commission's biennial report. The Commission's response has been that certainly any data provided to national professional associations that could respond appropriately to the biennial report requirements should be used for both purposes.

Because of the apparent variation in interim reporting requirements, more staff work will need to be conducted before staff can say whether an organization's annual or periodic reports can be used in lieu of the Commission's report. Staff proposes that once a request for alignment of standards has been received by the Commission, staff will investigate the specific accreditation activities of the organization and report to the Committee. At that time, the Committee will be able to make a determination as to the comparability of the interim reporting and site visit activities of the national or professional organization with the Commission's adopted procedures.



Application for National or Professional Organization Standards Alignment to California’s Adopted Standards

An institution or program sponsor approved to offer educator preparation programs in California may request to utilize either national or professional organization standards in lieu of the adopted California standards. Or the national or professional organization may request that an alignment of their standards to the adopted California standards be completed. To begin the alignment process, this application should be submitted a minimum of six months to one year prior to the planned implementation of the program under the national or professional organization’s standards.

Requesting Institution/Program Sponsor or National/Professional Organization

National or Professional Organization Standards for Which Alignment is Being Requested

Applicable California Standards

Alignment Options

Institution/Program Sponsor or National/Professional Organization Submits a Preliminary Alignment Matrix

Allow 3-6 months from submission of the preliminary matrix

Commission convenes a panel to review the preliminary alignment matrix

Committee on Accreditation reviews the proposed Alignment Matrix and decides if there is sufficient alignment between the Commission’s adopted standards and the National/Professional Organization. If there are concepts missing from the national/professional organization’s standards, specific elements of the adopted California standards may be identified and must be addressed in addition to the national or professional organization’s standards.

Institution/Program Sponsor or National/Professional Organization requests the Commission to complete an Alignment Matrix

Allow 6-12 months from the request

Commission convenes a panel to develop an alignment matrix

Submit Application to Teri Ackerman

1900 Capitol Ave
Sacramento, CA 95811
tackerman@ctc.ca.gov
916-324-8927 fax

Appendix B
NCATE's Specialized Professional Associations

NCATE Recognized Professional Organization	Corresponding California Credential	Standards Adopted/Revised	Alignment	On-going Review Process
1. Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI)		Newly adopted standards in 2007		Information Not Available
2. Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)	Education Specialist	2001 edition of CEC standards		
3. National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)	Early Childhood Specialist	Initial Preparation: 2001 edition Advanced Preparation: 2002 edition	Very Close*	4 Step accreditation process: 1) Eligibility – Application Process deems program eligible for candidacy 2) Candidacy – program needs to prepare formal self assessment 3) 2Day site visit 4) Accreditation Decision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accredited (5 years) • Deferred (program can rectify issues with standards in short period of time.) • Denied (program would need a significant amount of time to meet all 10 standards) 5) Continued accreditation requires annual reports, reports of program changes, and unannounced visits to randomly selected programs.
4. National Association for Gifted Children	None			N/A to California
5. National Middle	None			N/A to California

NCATE Recognized Professional Organization	Corresponding California Credential	Standards Adopted/Revised	Alignment	On-going Review Process
School Association (NMSA)				
6. Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)		AECT standards (2000)		
7. International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)		ISTE Standards for Technology Facilities and Leadership (2001) Computer Science Education (2002)		
8. American Library Association (ALA)	Library Media Teacher	2002 edition ALA/AASL	Very Close*	Information not available
9. National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)	Pupil Personnel Services: Psychology	2000 edition of NASP standards Updated every 7- 10 years (currently scheduled for 2010)	Close* Aligned with CTC except for Standards 6, 8, 9, 25	University submits self study addressing standards including candidate assessment data. Volunteer review team reviews self study. Team sends report to NASP board. NASP sends institution a report with status based on review team report Possible accreditation options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full accreditation (7 years) • New program accred. (3 years) • Conditional (1 year to address concerns) • Denial
10. International	Reading	2003 edition of	Close*	Program report is submitted to NCATE 6 months before site

NCATE Recognized Professional Organization	Corresponding California Credential	Standards Adopted/Revised	Alignment	On-going Review Process
Reading Association (IRA)	Specialist	the IRA standards		visit. 3 IRA reviewers review report Reviewers compile composite report with recommendation regarding accreditation and national recognition. Accreditation decisions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National recognition • Recognition with condition • Not Nationally Recognized If program earns national recognition, annual report is required and regular site visits are conducted (time period unclear).
11. Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) (composed of three associations)* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELCC – District • ELCC – Building 	Administrative Services	2001 edition ELCC standards	Close*	Process not available on website. (No California programs listed as accredited by this body in state by state listing.)
12. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)		2001 edition of TESOL		

* ELCC is composed of Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and is Administered by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration)

Accrediting Bodies Recognized by NCATE (Programs not required to submit for NCATE Program Review)

Professional Organization	Corresponding California Credential	Standards Adopted/Revised	Alignment	On-going Review Process
American Library Association (ALA)	Library Media Teacher	2002 edition ALA/AASL	Very Close*	Information not available.
American Psychological Association (APA)				Program submit a self study, site visit team conducts review. Once accreditation is awarded, annual written reports and fees, as well as periodic (timeline for these unclear) site visits, and possible specially scheduled site visits.
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)		New Standards 2008 AHSA Standards		Initial Evaluation of Application Site Visit Conducted Accreditation Awarded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial 5 years, Reaccred 8 years • Initial 3 years, Reaccred 5 years • Probation (1 year) • Withhold Accreditation If Accreditation awarded: Annual Reports required, with indication of program changes and how those changes impact standards alignment. Site visit at scheduled time period.
Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)	School Counseling	New Standards to be adopted in 2009 (reviewed every 7 years)	Comparable to CTC's except for Standards 8 and 9	IHE Submits initial self study readiness for site visit determined by review panel On Site Visit (Sun-Wed) CACREP board reviews IHE response Two types of approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full accreditation (8 yrs.) • Conditional (2 years) All required to submit mid-cycle reports in 4 th year (major changes)

Other Associations Not Included Above

Professional Organization	Corresponding California Credential	Standards Adopted/Revised	Alignment	On-going Review Process
Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)	School Social Work	CSWE Standards, 2001 Standards reviewed once every 7-9 years	Not available	University submit self study addressing standards Self study reviewed by Commissioners, assign which standards to be reviewed on site visit Site visit conducted over 1-1.5 days (this new process begins in 2009) Report of site visit by volunteer reviewers. 3-6 months to respond Full accreditation given after response (8 years). No interim or mid cycle report due once full accreditation.
No national body	Child Welfare and Attendance			No National Body